

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-17, 19-24, and 26-28, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected on prior art grounds. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-17, 19-24, and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Park, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,429,084), hereinafter referred to as Park. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-17, 19-24, and 26-28 again stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Park, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,429,084), hereinafter referred to as Park. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion. Specifically, regarding independent claims 1, 9, 16 and 24, Park does not teach or suggest the following features: (1) "forming spacers with a target spacer width adjacent to said gate stack, wherein in order to achieve said target spacer width a combined height of said gate conductor and said at least one sacrificial layer is predetermined" and (2) "wherein said target spacer width is predetermined to ensure that said spacers (or said temporary spacers, see claim 24) sufficiently separate said source and drain regions (or said raised source and drain regions, see claims 9, 16 and 24) from said gate stack so as to avoid lateral encroachment of said impurity into a channel region

below said gate stack regardless of a height of said gate conductor.” Regarding independent claims 16 and 24 Park also does not teach or suggest the feature “said process of epitaxially growing said raised source and drain regions is performed in the absence of doping impurities”. The Applicants further submit that the feature of claim 9 of “after said epitaxially growing of said raised source and drain regions, implanting an impurity into said raised source and drain regions and into said substrate below said raised source and drain regions” and the similar feature of claim 24 of “simultaneously implanting an impurities into said raised source/drain regions and into said substrate below said raised source/drain regions” are also not disclosed in Park.

A. Restatement of Applicants’ Traversal Of The Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-17, 19-24, and 26-28 under §1.102(b)

Regarding independent claims 1, 9, 16 and 24, Park does not teach or suggest the following features: (1) “forming spacers with a target spacer width adjacent to said gate stack, wherein in order to achieve said target spacer width a combined height of said gate conductor and said at least one sacrificial layer is predetermined” and (2) “wherein said target spacer width is predetermined to ensure that said spacers (or said temporary spacers, see claim 24) sufficiently separate said source and drain regions (or said raised source and drain regions, see claims 9, 16 and 24) from said gate stack so as to avoid lateral encroachment of said impurity into a channel region below said gate stack regardless of a height of said gate conductor.” Regarding independent claims 16 and 24 Park also does not teach or suggest the feature “said process of epitaxially growing said raised source and drain regions is performed in the absence of doping impurities”.

The cited prior art and the present invention each provide methods for forming CMOS transistors with raised source and drain regions; however, the problems addressed are different as are the processes used to solve the problems.

The present invention addresses the problem of encroachment of source/drain dopants into the channel region when gate heights are scaled. That is, with increased scaling of CMOS structures and, specifically, of gate heights, implanting dopants with sufficient energy to dope the source and drain regions and halos using the polygate as a self-aligned mask can cause the dopants to laterally diffuse through the substrate into the channel region as well as penetrate through the poly gate and the gate dielectric into the channel as the gate height is decreased (see paragraphs [0001-0006]). Sidewall spacers are used to avoid lateral encroachment. However, with a shorter gate height, the maximum achievable size of the sidewall spacers is reduced due to the reduced step height for reactive ion etch of a deposited spacer material of a given thickness. Thus, the spacers may not be sufficiently wide enough to avoid lateral encroachment of S/D dopants and also there may be a higher probability of silicide bridging between the gate and the S/D. This problem becomes more severe when using epitaxially grown raised source and drain structures because epitaxial overgrowth occurs on top of the gate with reduced height. The undesirably overgrown epitaxial polysilicon over the gate would also be silicided which would form a conductive path between the gate and the raised source/drain regions, resulting in failure of transistor function. Therefore, as mentioned in paragraphs [0008-10], [0030], [0036], [0039]) of the present application, the method of the invention forms a gate stack with a gate conductor and at least one sacrificial layer.

10/604,912

16

Best Available Copy

Spacers are then formed with a target spacer width adjacent to that gate stack. The target spacer width is predetermined to ensure that the spacers sufficiently separate the source and drain regions from the gate stack so as to avoid lateral encroachment of the impurity into the channel region. In order to achieve this target spacer width, regardless of the height of the gate conductor alone, the combined height of the gate conductor and the sacrificial layer(s) is predetermined.

Contrarily, Park addresses the problem of unwanted overgrown epi growth on the gate and STI but not the formation of spacers sufficiently large enough to avoid unwanted lateral diffusion of dopants into channel regions when gate heights are reduced. Specifically, Park discloses a method of forming CMOS transistors with raised source and drain regions (col. 1, lines 5-6). In the Park method a conventional gate stack is formed with several thin sacrificial layers above the 120nm gate conductor (col. 1, lines 58-62). These sacrificial layers protect the surface of the gate conductor during subsequent processing. A protective nitride layer is deposited over the substrate and the gate-sacrificial layers (col. 1, lines 66-67). Temporary spacers are formed on the protective nitride layer against the gate stack and a width of these temporary spacers is "set to define the area for the halo and extensions implants" (col. 2, lines 1-5). A portion of the protective layer 60 above the substrate is etched to define the source and drain regions and then, the temporary spacers are removed (col. 2, lines 25-30). Then, the source and drain regions 34 are implanted; although this step can be omitted if the source and drain regions were previously implanted (col. 2, lines 33-34; see Figure 5). Column 2, lines 34-37 provide that "the layer 60 is thick enough to block the implant in the region

that will contain the extension implant.” After the source and drain regions 34 are implanted in the substrate, raised source and drain regions are epitaxially grown (col. 2, lines 43-47; see Figure 7). Unwanted epi growth is prevented by the remaining nitride layer on the gate stack and adjacent to the gate stack in the area of the substrate designated for the S/D extension. Then, after additional processing steps, extension and halo implantation is performed (col. 2, lines 48-64), which also implants the raised epitaxially grown source and drain regions.

Park does not address the issue of lateral encroachment of the impurities (i.e., dopants) from the source and drain regions into the channel because the Park transistor does not have a reduced gate height and, thus, the ability to form spacers with a width sufficient enough to avoid lateral encroachment of the dopants into the channel region was not a problem for Park. Specifically, Park mentions that the widths of the spacers that are formed adjacent to the gate conductor are “set to define the area for the halo and extensions implants” (see col. 2, lines 1-5). Park also indicates that the nitride layer 60 is thick enough to block penetration by the source/drain dopant through the nitride layer down into the area of the substrate designated for the halo and extensions implants (col. 2, lines 34-37) and further discusses the protection provided by sacrificial layers 51, 52 and 54 during subsequent processing. However, the Park gate conductor was disclosed as nominally 120nm thick (see col. 1, lines 57-60) and, thus, those skilled in the art will recognize the gate height was sufficiently tall to achieve spacers with the required target spacer width. Therefore, an alternative technique for achieving the target spacer width was not needed, considered or disclosed. That is, Park does not disclose that sacrificial

layers are added to the gate stack in order to achieve a gate stack with a predetermined combined height that is sufficient for a target spacer width to be achieved because that target spacer width was already achievable. That is, given the gate height of Park, spacers could be made that sufficiently separate the source and drain regions from the gate stack to avoid lateral encroachment of the S/D impurities into the channel region without additional processing.

The Office Action indicates that Park avoids lateral encroachment "because the use of the spacer as well dummy spacer is intended to avoid such problem." That may be true; however, the Applicants submit that lateral encroachment is only avoided in Park because the height of the gate conductor was not reduced and, thus, was sufficiently tall to produce spacers with the necessary width. Since no specific accommodations were made for the reduced gate height in Park, if the gate conductor of Park was scaled, the target spacer width necessary to avoid lateral encroachment may or may not be achievable with the Park method. That is, if a "combined height of the gate conductor and the sacrificial layers" is not predetermined so that the target spacer width can be achieved, lateral encroachment of source/drain dopants into the channel region will necessarily occur. Thus, the fact that the Park Figures do not illustrate impurities under the gate conductor is irrelevant because the gate height of Park is not reduced and, so lateral encroachment did not need to be considered. Additionally, support for the fact that lateral diffusion of dopants was not even considered by Park is found in the fact that not only do the drawings fail to show lateral diffusion of impurities into the channel region but also fail to show any lateral diffusion of impurities at all. Those skilled in the

10/604,912

19

Best Available Copy

art would recognize that such lateral diffusion would necessarily occur to some extent, especially following the epi growth process. Thus, the lack of lateral dopant diffusion in the Park Figures only supports the fact that lateral diffusion was not considered by Park. It does not support the a finding that Park disclosed that the combined height of the gate stack was predetermined so that spacers with a predetermined target spacer width could be achieved in order to avoid lateral encroachment of the source and drain impurities into the channel region.

Furthermore, regarding independent claims 9, 16 and 24, Park does not teach or suggest "after said epitaxially growing of said raised source and drain regions, implanting an impurity into said raised source and drain regions and into said substrate below said raised source and drain regions, wherein implanting said impurity after said epitaxially growing of said raised source and drain regions avoids subjecting said impurity to the thermal budget of said epitaxially growing process" (see paragraphs [0042] and [0047]). Specifically, Park discloses implanting the source and drain regions in the substrate *before growing the epi* (col. 2, lines 33-48, see Figure 5). The impurities implanted into these source and drain regions in the substrate would necessarily be subjected to the epi process (col. 2, lines 44-48, see Figure 7) with a conventional temperature range from about 750°C-850°C) and, thus, subjected to the deleterious effects of transient enhanced diffusion of impurities, such as boron.

The Office Action cites Figures 9 and 10 as disclosing that the implant to form the S/D extension 35 is conducted after the epitaxial layer is formed. However, the S/D extension 35 is not the same as the source/drain regions 34. Specifically, col. 2, lines 34-

40 disclose the implant of source/drain regions 34 in the substrate adjacent to that region of the substrate that is blocked by nitride 60 and defines the area of the substrate that will contain the extension. After the source/drain regions 34 are implanted into the substrate, the epi process is performed (see col. 2, lines 40-48) and the dopants in the source/drain regions are necessarily subjected to the thermal epi process resulting in diffusion of the s/d dopants. Col. 2, lines 56-58 and associated Figures 9-10 simply disclose that after the epi is grown, a thermal oxide layer is grown on the epi (Figure 9) and a second implant process is used to implant the halos and extensions (Figure 10) to avoid subjecting the halos/extensions to the thermal epi process. Again, the source/drain regions 34 that are *below* the raised source/drain regions 36 of Figures 9-10 were doped prior to the epi process (see Figure 5).

Lastly, regarding independent claim 16 and 24, Park does not teach or suggest “wherein said process of epitaxially growing said raised source and drain regions is performed in the absence of doping impurities.” The Office Action cites Figures 9 and 10 as teaching this feature. However, as mentioned above, Park teaches doping the source and drain regions 34 in the substrate prior to growing the epi on those source and drain regions (see Figures 5-7 and associated text in the Specification). Thus, Park necessarily teaches that the process of epitaxially growing the raised source and drain regions 36 is performed in the presence of doping impurities.

B. Comments Directed To The “Response To Arguments” Section of Final Office Action

In response to the April 18, 2006 Amendment filed by the Applicants, the Final

Office Action indicates the following:

- (1) "For example, as depicted in Fig. 5, the S/D implantation occurs in the presences of oxide liner 42 and nitride spacer 60 that is sufficient to avoid encroachment of said impurity into a channel region, (i.e., to avoid short-circuiting of the device)."

The Applicants respectfully disagree because Fig. 5 shows the existence of an oxide liner 42 and nitride spacer 60, it does not show that the liner 42/spacer 60 are sufficient to avoid encroachment (and particularly lateral encroachment) of an impurity into a channel region.

- (2) "As depicted in Figs. 2 and 3, the sacrificial spacer 70 and of oxide liner 42 and nitride spacer 60 (i.e., the target spacers) have combined predetermined height and width. In addition, the spacers have predetermined thickness and height that ensure that sufficient separation during that source and drain regions formation so that lateral encroachment of said impurity into a channel region below said gate stack regardless of a height of said gate conductor could be avoided."

The Applicants respectfully disagree because Figs 2 and 3 show that the sacrificial spacer 70, oxide liner 42 and nitride spacer 60 necessarily have a combined height.

10/604,912

22

Best Available Copy

However, they do not show that the "target spacer width (i.e., the width of spacer 60) is predetermined to ensure that said spacers (or said temporary spacers, see claim 24) sufficiently separate said source and drain regions (or said raised source and drain regions, see claims 9, 16 and 24) from said gate stack so as to avoid lateral encroachment of said impurity into a channel region below said gate stack regardless of a height of said gate conductor". Park only mentions that the widths of the spacers that are formed adjacent to the gate conductor are "set to define the area for the halo and extensions implants" (see col. 2, lines 1-5). It does not disclose any other details regarding the width of the spacers.

- (3) "During formation of epitaxially growing the raised source/drain regions 36, as shown in Figs. 6-8, there is no impurity doping is performed. Therefore, the formation of the raised s/d regions 36 are formed in the absence of doping impurities."

The Applicants respectfully disagree. Figs. 6-8 show that the epi regions 36 are formed in the presence of doping impurities because the epi 36 is grown on doped region 34. there is no impurity doping is performed. Therefore, the formation of raised s/d regions 36 are formed in the absence of doping impurities.

- (4) "As shown in Figs. 1-4, the target spacers (42, 60, 70) are formed to protect the gate electrode and the channel region under the gate electrode during

amorphization ion implant process (see Figs. 2 and 3) prior implanting the S/D/ implant. In Additiona, non the drawing shown diffusion of the impurities under the gate conductor (i.e., in the channel region) as shown in Figs. 5-8. As shown Fig. 5, the target spacer protects the channel region for impurities during the S/D implantation process. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the lateral encroachment never occur in Park et. al. '084 disclosure because the use of spacer as well dummy spacer is intended to avoid such problem. This is the art-recognized problem so that Park et al. '084 process also intended to avoid such a problem."

The Applicants respectfully disagree. Lateral encroachment is avoided in Park because the height of the gate conductor was not reduced and, thus, the gate stack was sufficiently tall to produce spacers with the necessary width. No specific accommodations were made for reduced gate height in Park. That is, if a "combined height of the gate conductor and the sacrificial layers" is not predetermined so that the target spacer width can be achieved, lateral encroachment of source/drain dopants into the channel region will necessarily occur. As stated above, the fact that the Park Figures do not illustrate impurities under the gate conductor is irrelevant because the gate height of Park is not reduced and, so lateral encroachment would not occur and did not need to be considered. Additionally, also as mentioned above, the fact that the cited figures fail to show lateral encroachment in the channel only illustrates that lateral diffusion was not addressed/considered by Park. Lateral diffusion would occur at least to some extent and

Park does not illustrate any lateral diffusion at all. While lateral encroachment may be "an art recognized problem," a structure that prevented it was not disclosed in Park.

(5) "[T]he implant form S/D extension is conducted after the epitaxial layer formed (see Figs. 9 and 10). Furthermore, the impurities 35' below the epi-layer 36 (see Fig. 10) is occurred due to the implantation process after the epitaxial layer 36 is formed and does not required any heating (annealing) process to diffuse the dopant into the epitaxial layer 36, as shown in Fig. 10 (i.e., wherein implanting the impurities after epitaxially growing the raised source and drain regions avoids subjecting the impurities to the thermal budget of the epitaxially grown."

The Applicants respectfully disagree. However, the S/D extension 35 is not the same as the source/drain regions 34. Specifically, col. 2, lines 34-40 disclose the implant of source/drain regions 34 in the substrate adjacent to that region of the substrate that is blocked by nitride 60 and defines the area of the substrate that will contain the extension. After the source/drain regions 34 are implanted into the substrate, the epi process is performed (see col. 2, lines 40-48) and the dopants in the source/drain regions are necessarily subjected to the thermal epi process resulting in diffusion of the s/d dopants. Col. 2, lines 56-58 and associated Figures 9-10 simply disclose that after the epi is grown, a thermal oxide layer is grown on the epi (Figure 9) and a second implant process is used to implant the halos and extensions (Figure 10) to avoid subjecting the halos/extensions

10/604,912

25

Best Available Copy

to the thermal epi process. Specifically, after the raised source/drain regions 36 are epitaxially grown on the doped regions 34 in the substrate in Park, regions 35 and 37 are implanted into the substrate in an area immediately adjacent to the previously doped regions 34 (not into the substrate below the epi layer 36) and regions 35' and 37' are implanted into the raised s/d epi regions 36 (not into the doped s/d regions 34 below the epi layer 36, as suggested)(see Figures 5, 9-10 and the associated text in the specification of Park). Thus, in Park impurities are not simultaneously implanted into both the raised source and drain regions and into the substrate below the raised source and drain regions (see claims 9 and 24 of the present invention). Additionally, the doped source/drain regions 34 of Figure 5 are necessarily subjected to the thermal budgeting of the epi growth process at Figure 7.

B. Final Comments.

MPEP §2131 provides guidance regarding 35 U.S.C. §102 Anticipation rejections and specifically states that "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). It further states that "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that each and every element has not been disclosed by Park and, more particularly, that the identical invention is not shown in as complete detail as contained in the claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit

10/604,912

26

Best Available Copy

that independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 24 are patentable over the prior art of record. Further, dependent claims 4-8, 11-15, 17, 19-23 and 26-28 are similarly patentable, not only by virtue of their dependency from a patentable independent claim, but also by virtue of the additional features of the invention they define. Moreover, the Applicants note that all claims are properly supported in the specification and accompanying drawings, and no new matter is being added. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

II. Formal Matters and Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-17, 19-24, and 26-28, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0458.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/10/

Gibb I.P. Law Firm, LLC
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
Voice: (410) 573-0227
Fax: (301) 261-8825
Customer Number: 29154



Pamela M. Riley, Esq.
Registration No. 40,146